



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_32702
Title of the Manuscript:	β -sitosterol and its 3-O-glucosid as novel acaricides against Rhipicephalus (B.) annulatus ticks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is very interesting, since it is research about a medicinal plant that could have an negative effect on ticks. The manuscript has some major problems (cited below) and requires major revision.</p> <p>Title does not reflect the content of the manuscript, add the name of the plant you researched</p> <p>A long the text the size and type of the letter is different</p> <p>Abstract Conclusion – wrong conclusion, you evaluated the in vitro effect of a botanical compound, you did not evaluated its addition into other chemical compounds</p> <p>The aim of the study is unclear, sometime is to evaluate a plant, the addition of it in other compounds, just the evaluation of some components of the plant..clarify</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is changed Format is now consistent Conclusion is changed It is called biologically-guided isolation of active constituents. We evaluate the plant first then go deeper to evaluate the fractions of the extract –which contain compounds of different polarities- then after chromatographic isolation of the secondary metabolites, we evaluated the activity of the major compounds. M forsskaii is written in full name when first mentioned



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Introduction M forsskaoui – write the full name (first time only)</p> <p>MM 2.1. – a lot of information that has no connection between. Add his info in other parts (organize) inside MM</p> <p>2.5. – negative control group – with what?? % of deltamethrin??Manufacture??</p> <p>2.6. change to = 10mL of each treatment Change = after 2 min, each substance or treatment..</p> <p>After 7 days will be considered dead – dead ticks and ticks which did not ovoposit is different – which parameter did you actually used? You could have done as described by Drummond 1973 – after the evaluation of the oviposition, the eggs could be kept to check larvae hatching</p>	<p>2.1 contains list of used instruments and their specifications and chemicals and usually not connected to each other</p> <p>-Control negative (50% DMSO-EtOH). It is the solvent used to dissolve extracts and compounds</p> <p>Deltamethrin 50µg/ml (Butox ® 50 Intervet International B.V. Netherlands) listed in 2.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 2 min, the liquid • Dead tick % was estimated mainly based on checking loss of mobility and blacking of the cuticle of adult ticks. Ticks in the different treated groups died before egg deposition. Therefore, there was no lying to estimate egg mass deposition and hatchability. On the other side, some treatments did not show adulticidal activity and the life ticks were not showing significant difference in deposit eggs mass and hatching % in a comparison with the untreated control.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>2.7. Did you count or weight the larvae??(you mention 100) Mortality was determined by %?</p> <p>Discussion Very poor and confusing. Organize this part after you clarify the aim of you work. Then you can decide what do you want to focus</p> <p>Table 1. Remove the last two lines (b is significant....e is sigfinicant)</p> <p>Fig 2. Remove</p> <p>Conclusion n-hexane extract are probably responsible</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 100 larvae were counted and added to each one <p>Mortality % was calculated (Dead/ total * 100)</p> <p>Discussion is re-written,</p> <p>Fig2 is very crucial for the efficacy of the plant treatment as it shows the dead ticks with black cuticle and how much are they different from the live ticks in the control group</p> <p>Conclusion is re-written</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		